1

1

PATENT

Atty. Docket No.: 41EB-9023

Remarks

Applicants and the undersigned wish to express their appreciation to the Examiner for the courtesies he extended during a telephone interview that occurred on January 23, 2007. During the interview a Restriction Requirement was discussed. Specifically, the Examiner has restricted the Claims of the presently pending application into six Groups. More Specifically, Group I includes Claims 1-6, 36-49, 95-100, and 130-135 which are searched under Class/Subclass 707/2; Group II includes Claims 7-10, 50-54, 101-104, and 136-148 which are searched under Class/Subclass 707/4; Group III includes Claims 11-23 and 105-117 which are searched under Class/Subclass 706/6; Group IV includes Claims 24-26, 65-83, 118-120, and 149-151 which are searched under Class/Subclass 707/3; Group V includes Claims 27-35, 84-94, 121-129, and 152-160 which are searched under Class/Subclass 707/10; and Group VI includes Claim 161 which is searched under Class/Subclass 715/5. The foregoing Amendment has been made in consequence of the Examiner Interview.

In response to the election/restriction requirement set forth in the Office Action, Applicants elect for prosecution in this application of the Group I. Claims 1-6, 36-49, 95-100, and 130-135 are in the elected Group.

The requirement for election is traversed because the inventions set out by the claims clearly are related, a thorough search and examination of any claim group (it is believed) would be relevant to the examination of the other group, and requirements for election are not mandatory under 35 USC. Accordingly, reconsideration of the election requirement is requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michael J. A. Leinduer Registration No. 55,795

ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600

St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740

(314) 621-5070